



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/143,828	08/31/1998	ANDERS BERKENSTAM	10806-65	4054

7590 09/16/2002

HOLLY D KOZLOWSKI
DINSMORE & SHOHL
1900 CHEMED CENTER
255 EAST FIFTH STREET
CINCINNATI, OH 45202

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

PAK, MICHAEL D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1646	

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2002

Lσ

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/143,828

Applicant(s)

Berkenstam et al.

Examiner

Michael Pak

Art Unit
1646



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 15, 2002
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
- 4) Claim(s) 1-9, 13-17, 29-31, 33, and 42-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) 29-31 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-9, 13-17, 33, and 42-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Prosecution Application

1. The request filed on 15 July 2002 (Paper No. 19) for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 09/143,828 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.

2. This application contains claims 29-31 drawn to an invention non-elected with traverse in Paper No. 11. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) MPEP § 821.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. Claims 1-9, 13-17, 32-33 and 42-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a substantial asserted utility or a well established utility.

The reason for the rejection has been set forth in the previous office action.

Claims 1-9, 13-17, 32-33 and 42-55 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a substantial asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use

the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Claims 1-9, 13-17, 32-33, 42-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-9, 13-17, 32-33, and 42-55 encompass the term "substantially the same" or "recombinant type" whose metes and bounds ambiguous because no specific structural limitations are provided. Claims encompass sequence similarity with hVDR or xONR1 domains whose metes and bounds are not clear. Applicants argue that the specification on page 7 defines the term "substantially the same", but the definition encompasses derived sequences which appears more generic than the term alleles and the metes and bounds are not clear.

5. Claims 1-9, 13-17, 32-33, and 42-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a written

description rejection.

Claims encompass the DNA or vectors and cells comprising the DNA encoding a variant protein which is naturally occurring but not disclosed in the specification nor to one of skilled in the art. Claimed DNA encoding protein variants encompass a large genus of nuclear receptors which are alleles or variants whose function has yet to be identified from different species of animal because the structure of the newly identified naturally occurring receptor is not known. The essential feature of the claimed invention is DNA encoding an orphan receptor whose function is not known. *University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.* (CAFC) 43 USPQ2d 1398 held that a generic claim to human or mammalian when only the rat protein sequence was disclosed did not have written description in the specification. Thus, the genus of orphan receptors structure cannot be envisioned.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. Claims 1-9, 13-15, 32-33, and 42-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kausch et al. (A).

The reason for the rejection has been set forth previously.

Applicants argue that Kausch teach chromosomal DNA. However, the chromosomal DNA comprises the claimed nucleic acid especially the generic claims. The newly amended claims are

still generic and encompasses the DNA of Kausch.

7. No claim is allowed.

8. This is a CPA of applicant's earlier Application No. 09/143,828. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Pak, whose telephone number is (703) 305-7038. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 2:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler, can be reached on (703) 308-6564.

Official papers filed by fax should be directed to (703) 308-4242.

Serial Number: 09/143,828
Art Unit: 1646

Page 5

Faxed draft or informal communications with the examiner should be directed to (703) 308-0294.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Michael D. Pak

Michael Pak
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1646
13 September 2002